

**REMARKS**

Claims 10-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-9 have been canceled and claims 10-30 have been added. Claims 10, 13 and 14 are independent. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

**I. Amendment**

Support for new claims 10-18 can be found in the specification at, for example, original claims 1-8, respectively; support for new claims 19, 23 and 27 can be found in the specification at, for example, Fig. 9 and Original Claims 1, 4 and 5; support for new claims 20, 24 and 28 can be found in the specification at, for example, Figs. 9 and 13 and paragraph [0046]; support for new claims 21, 25 and 29 can be found in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0061] and [0062]; and support for new claims 22, 26 and 30 can be found in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0033] and [0040]. Thus, no new matter is added.

**II. Interview**

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Chu at the personal interview held March 2, 2011 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview.

**III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-9 have been canceled rendering the rejection moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**IV. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 7,565,004 to Hashimoto. This rejection is respectfully traversed as applied to new claims 10-30.

Independent claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, "partitioning a whole area of the transformed image to be obtained by a projection transformation of the original image into a plurality of regions, wherein none of the regions is intersected by any of two mutually perpendicular axes that extend in a plane containing the transformed image and pass through an origin of the whole area, at least one of the regions has a side of the region defined by one of the axes." Independent claims 13 and 14 recite similar subject matter. The applied reference fails to teach or render obvious the recited features of independent claims 10, 13 and 14.

As discussed during the interview, the Office Action alleges that the two bold intersecting lines of Fig. 6 of Hashimoto correspond with the recited axes. However, the bold intersecting lines pass through at least one region of the 8x8 grid. See Fig. 6 of Hashimoto.

In addition, where one image is divided into a plurality of regions and a transformation is performed for each region, the setting of the regions is a problem. Specifically, the image is that obtained by photography includes distortion. If the distortion is not taken into account in setting the regions, there is a danger that the data that is referred to in the interpolation of pixels or the like that is required for the geometrical transformation will not be contained in the regions that are set as the object of processing. See page 3, lines 4-12. However, in the present application, the processing ensures that pixel data that is the object of the projection transformation and interpolation processing can be securely read out because the regions do not contain central axes. See page 17, lines 1-7. Thus, Hashimoto fails to teach or render obvious partitioning a whole area of the transformed image to be obtained by a projection transformation of the original image into a plurality of regions,

wherein none of the regions is intersected by any of two mutually perpendicular axes that extend in a plane containing the transformed image and pass through an origin of the whole area, at least one of the regions has a side of the region defined by one of the axes. Thus, the applied reference fails to teach or render obvious the recited features of independent claims 10, 13 and 14.

The dependent claims are patentable at least due to their dependence on allowable independent claims 10, 13 and 14 and for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

V. **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino  
Registration No. 33,565

Obert H. Chu  
Registration No. 52,744

MAC:OHC/kjb

Attachment:  
Amendment Transmittal

Date: March 9, 2011

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry of this filing;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461